

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
	Are your source water protection programs voluntary or mandatory?
Alaska	Voluntary
Arizona	Voluntary
Arkansas	Voluntary
Colorado	Voluntary
Delaware	Mandatory
Idaho	Voluntary
Kansas	Voluntary
Louisiana	Voluntary
Maine	Voluntary
Massachusetts	MassDEP does not require public water suppliers to develop Source Water Protection 'Programs'. Instead, public water systems are required to implement specific source water protection measures, including adoption of local protection controls, land ownership/control and protection plans.
Michigan	Voluntary
Minnesota	Voluntary
Mississippi	Voluntary
Missouri	Voluntary
Montana	Voluntary
Nebraska	Voluntary
Nevada	Voluntary
New Hampshire	Voluntary and some are Mandatory
New Mexico	Voluntary
North Carolina	Voluntary
Ohio	Voluntary
South Dakota	Voluntary
Tennessee	Mandatory
Texas	Voluntary
Utah	Mandatory
West Virginia	Voluntary
Wisconsin	Voluntary and some are Mandatory
Wyoming	Voluntary
	Who writes the wellhead protection program plans and surface water intake protection plans?
Alaska	Communities write their own program
Arizona	State Program staff, Consultants, Communities write their own program
Arkansas	State Program staff

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
Colorado	State Program staff
Delaware	State Program staff, Consultants, Communities write their own program
Idaho	State Program staff, Consultants
Kansas	State Program staff, Consultants, Communities write their own program
Louisiana	State Program staff
Maine	Consultants, Communities write their own program
Massachusetts	MassDEP's Drinking Water Program has developed guidance documents to assist water suppliers in developing surface water supply protection and wellhead protection plans (not programs). Surface Water Supply Protection Plans are required by regulation. Wellhead Protection Plans are (at this time) voluntary. Water suppliers may write their own protection plans or can hire a consultant. MassDEP does not write protection plans for water suppliers. MassRural Water Association has assisted numerous Massachusetts' small public water systems in developing source protection plans.
Michigan	State Program staff, Consultants, Communities write their own program
Minnesota	Wellhead Protection -
	Public water suppliers serving >3,300 or more persons are responsible for designating the WHPA and preparing the remainder of the WHP plan for approval by the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH). MDH or the Minnesota Rural Water Association (MRWA) provides direct technical assistance for plan development when requested by the public water supplier.
	The MDH will designate the WHPA for a public water supplier serving between 500 to 3,300 persons but the public water supplier is responsible for preparing the remainder of the WHP plan for MDH approval. MDH or the MRWA provides direct technical assistance for plan development when requested by the public water supplier.
	The MDH will designate the WHPA and prepare the remainder of the WHP plan for public water supply systems serving fewer than 500 persons. The public water supplier must assume responsibility for the plan by requesting MDH approval of the plan even though MDH prepared it (this step meets state rule requirements for plan approval). MDH or the MRWA provides direct technical assistance for plan development when requested by the public water supplier.
	Note: The MRWA provides assistance to public water suppliers for preparing WHP plans but does not delineate WHPAs because they do not have staff who are licensed geoscientists.
	Intake Protection –
	The public water supplier is responsible for designating the intake protection area and for preparing the remainder of the intake protection plan. MDH or MRWA staff provide technical assistance for plan preparation. MDH formally approves the plan.
Mississippi	State Program staff
Missouri	Communities write their own program
Montana	State Program staff, Consultants, Communities write their own program
Nebraska	Communities write their own program
Nevada	Consultants, Communities write their own program
New Hampshire	Consultants, Communities write their own program
New Mexico	State Program staff, Communities write their own program
North Carolina	Consultants, Communities write their own program

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
Ohio	Consultants, Communities write their own program
South Dakota	Communities write their own program
Tennessee	Communities write their own program
Texas	State Program staff, Consultants, Communities write their own program
Utah	Communities write their own program
West Virginia	State Program staff, Consultants, Communities write their own program
Wisconsin	Consultants, Communities write their own program
Wyoming	Communities write their own program
	Financial assistance or incentives used by your state agency to promote source water protection programs include which of these?
Alaska	<p>Technical Assistance, Guidance documents, Other – Please explain: Endorsed Drinking Water Protection Plans used to decrease frequency of Sanitary Survey's and SOC Waiver approvals.</p> <p>We are exploring opportunities to get Endorsed Protection Water Plans incorporated into the Municipal Grant and Loan Program. Communities qualify these grants/loans by accumulating points. Our hope is to get Endorsed Drinking Water Protection Plans added as an option for obtaining additional points.</p>
Arizona	Technical Assistance, Guidance documents
Arkansas	No answer on question
Colorado	<p>Grants, Technical Assistance, Guidance documents, Operator Certification Credits for being involved with SWP, Awards. Colorado has implemented a statewide grant program to support source water protection development and implementation activities. The grant program is funded from 70% Wellhead funds (GW systems) and 30% Capacity Development funds (SW systems). A complete description of the grant program can be found on the SWAP website at:</p> <p>http://www.cdphe.state.co.us/wq/sw/protectionphasehom.htm</p>
Delaware	Technical Assistance, Guidance documents, Awards
Idaho	<p>Grants, Loans, Technical Assistance, Guidance documents, Awards. Idaho has implemented a new Source Water Protection Grant program this year. Loans for source water and ground water protection activities are also available through the Clean Water SRF program, however this has not been used. Other programs including Rural Development's drinking water grants and loans require that the PWS has a drinking water protection plan. We also offer a recognition plaque signed by DEQ, IRWA and the Governor when the PWS/community completed a certified DWPP. Information is available on our website at:</p> <p>http://www.deq.idaho.gov/Applications/gwqamg</p>
Kansas	Grants, Technical Assistance, Guidance documents
Louisiana	Grants, Technical Assistance, Guidance documents, Operator Certification Credits for being involved with SWP
Maine	Grants , Loans, technical Assistance

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
Massachusetts	Grants – MassDEP currently offers a land acquisition grant, Loans – water supply/quality infrastructure improvements, Technical Assistance – assistance with compliance, Guidance documents – protection plans and assistance with compliance, Operator Certification Credits for being involved with SWP - ongoing, Awards - annually
Michigan	Grants, Technical Assistance, Guidance documents, Operator Certification Credits for being involved with SWP. Michigan has a 50% state/ 50% local grant match for wellhead protection activities. Many elements are eligible for funding through this program. A comprehensive listing of activities is included in the Part 28 Wellhead Protection Grant Assistance Administrative Rules, R 325.12801 to R 352.12820. Communities with an approved SWIPP receive an additional 100 priority points for Michigan's Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund. http://www.michigan.gov/deq/0,1607,7-135-3313_3675_3695---,00.html http://www.deq.state.mi.us/documents/deq-wd-gws-whp-grant-program-rules.pdf
Minnesota	Wellhead Protection - Minnesota does not provide direct financial support for WHP but provides direct technical support to public water suppliers for preparing and implementing WHP plans. The strategy identified under question 1 was developed to address concerns from small-sized systems of having to meet an unfunded mandate. Having a mandatory WHP program ensures that a public water supplier will develop its WHP plan. However, MDH works with other agencies to help find financial and technical resources for plan implementation activities. Intake Protection – This program is in its infancy and the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) has provided CWA 319 funding and state funding to Minneapolis, St. Cloud, and St. Paul for intake protection planning. MDH and MPCA are investigating how intake protection can be integrated with TMDL works so that a new state funding mechanism (Clean Water Legacy) can be used to support intake protection.
Mississippi	Technical Assistance, Guidance documents
Missouri	Grants, Loans, Technical Assistance, Guidance documents
Montana	Technical Assistance, Guidance documents, SWP staff conduct well & septic system education seminars
Nebraska	Grants, Technical Assistance, Guidance documents, Operator Certification Credits for being involved with SWP
Nevada	Grants, Loans, Technical Assistance, Guidance documents. Nevada has a non-matching grant for development and implementation of WHP programs at the local level. The State Board for Financing Water Projects also reviews the status of locally developed WHP programs when considering communities and/or public water systems' applications for state grant and loan programs (such as the AB198 matching grant, and the Nevada DWSRF loan) http://www.ndep.nv.gov/bffwp/grants01.htm http://www.ndep.nv.gov/bwpc/wellhead.htm
New Hampshire	Grants, Technical Assistance, Guidance documents, Awards. Chemical monitoring (Phase II/V) waiver program
New Mexico	Loans, Technical Assistance, Guidance documents, Operator Certification Credits for being involved with SWP
North Carolina	Loans, technical Assistance, Guidance documents, We have emphasized priority consideration for cost share assistance to implement BMPs. We have other state agencies that partner with us to offer this incentive.
Ohio	Grants, Technical Assistance, Guidance documents, Operator Certification Credits for being involved with SWP

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
South Dakota	Although certain SWP activities associated with other projects may be eligible for funding under state grant or the DW SRF program , there is no direct source of funding for SWP.
Tennessee	Technical Assistance, Guidance documents, Operator Certification Credits for being involved with SWP
Texas	Loans, Technical Assistance, Guidance documents, Awards
Utah	Technical Assistance, Guidance documents
West Virginia	Grants, Technical Assistance, Guidance documents, awards. Grants program for wellhead protection and source water protection activities. Many elements are eligible for funding through this program. WV participates with EPA III region on SWAP awards. Information on these programs and guidance documents are available @ http://www.wvdhhr.org/oehs/eed/swap/
Wisconsin	Guidance documents. A wellhead protection (WHP) plan is required before any new municipal well is placed into service.
Wyoming	There aren't any financial incentives available.
	Briefly describe state legislation or rules for your source water protection programs. Please list and provide a web link, if available. Also, provide a web link for your general source water protection webpage.
Alaska	Statutory Regulations are found here: 18AAC 80.015 Well protection, source water protection and well decommissioning Program Website: http://www.dec.state.ak.us/eh/dw/DWP/source_water.html Information of Endorsed Protection Plans and Substantial Implementation can be found here: http://www.dec.state.ak.us/eh/docs/dw/DWP/substantial.pdf
Arizona	Drinking Water Rules link http://www.azdeq.gov/enviro/water/dw/rules.html (AZ Administrative Code, Title 18, Chapter 4) General SWP link http://www.azdeq.gov/enviro/water/dw/swap.html
Arkansas	We currently do not have statewide legislation regarding source water protection. http://www.healthyarkansas.com/eng/swp/swp.htm
Colorado	There is currently no state legislation or rules for source water protection. The SWAP program is voluntary. However, the state of Colorado and the Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission is considering SWAP protection zones for oil and gas drilling in a rulemaking scheduled for June 2008. The general SWAP website address is: http://www.cdphe.state.co.us/wq/sw/swap.htm
Delaware	Delaware passed its Source Water Protection law in 2001 which required local communities with 2000 or more residents to (a) adopt source water, wellhead, and excellent ground water recharge as critical areas into their comprehensive land use plans AND (b) adopt local ordinances to provide for protection of these areas. Both a and b above were to be done by December 2007. Web link is http://delcode.delaware.gov/title7/c060/sc06/index.shtml#TopOfPage

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
Idaho	There is currently no state legislation or rules for source water protection. The Source Water Protection program in Idaho is voluntary. Our website is: http://www.deq.idaho.gov/water/prog_issues/source_water/assessment.cfm
Kansas	No legislation or rules in the state of Kansas General webpage - http://www.kdheks.gov/nps/swap/
Louisiana	Our program is voluntary, and so there is no legislation for it. Our website is http://www.deq.louisiana.gov/aeps
Maine	Source water protection in Maine is a patchwork of many laws, regulations, and policies. We recently completed an evaluation of these for the legislature. The report is at http://www.maine.gov/dhhs/eng/water/Templates/Chapter140/chapter140.htm general SWP information is at http://www.maine.gov/dhhs/eng/water/Templates/Sections/SourceWaterProtection/sourcewaterprotection.htm
Massachusetts	(1). MA Drinking Water Regulations, 310 CMR 22.21(1), requires public water suppliers to own or control the Zone I of their drinking water wells (the Zone I is the immediate land area surrounding the wellhead). The water supplier must purchase this land or control it through a conservation restriction. Only drinking water supply related activities are allowed in a Zone I. (2). In addition, 310 CMR 22.21 requires that the recharge areas of drinking water supplies be protected by municipal controls (bylaws, ordinances and health regulations) that prohibit threatening land uses. MA Surface Water Supply Protection Regulations, 310 CMR 22.20 identify the land uses that are prohibited in surface water supply areas. MA Wellhead Protection Regulations 310 CMR 22.21(2) identifies the land uses that are prohibited in groundwater supply areas. (3). In addition to local controls, 310 CMR 22.20 requires public water suppliers with to develop an approved Surface Water Supply Protection Plan. http://www.mass.gov/dep/water/drinking/sourcewa.htm
Michigan	Administrative rules for the wellhead protection program provide a framework for what is required for program approval and what activities are grant eligible. There are no specific rules or legislation specific to surface water systems. http://www.michigan.gov/deq/0,1607,7-135-3313_3675_3693---,00.html http://www.deq.state.mi.us/documents/deq-wd-gws-whp-grant-program-rules.pdf
Minnesota	In Minnesota, WHP rule requirements are part of the public water supply rules (4720 parts .5100 to .5590) and can be viewed at – http://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/arule/4720/ The source water general web site can be viewed at – http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/eh/water/swp/index.htm
Mississippi	No state legislation or rules for the Source Water Protection Program. The web link is: www.deq.state.ms.us/MDEQ.nsf/page/GPB_GroundwaterPlanningBranch?OpenDocument
Missouri	Strictly voluntary. No webpage, yet.
Montana	The Montana Source Water Protection Program was approved by the EPA in November 1999. Chapter 75-7-120, MCA describes Montana's SWP Program.

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
	http://data.opi.state.mt.us/bills/mca/75/6/75-6-120.htm
	Adoption of local ordinances is covered under 7-5-103 through 7-5-107, MCA at
	http://data.opi.state.mt.us/bills/mca/7/5/7-5-103.htm
	The MT SWP Program General webpage can be found at
	http://deq.mt.gov/wqinfo/swp/index.asp
Nebraska	No state regulations.
Nevada	The State of Nevada has adopted water quality legislation and regulations to protect ground and surface water sources from potential contaminations. There are no specific rules or legislation for WHP or SWP program development within the state. Since the program is voluntary, Nevada gives the authority to local governments to develop and implement their source water protection plans. The link to our source water protection page is
	http://www.ndep.nv.gov/bwpc/sourcewater.htm
New Hampshire	SWP programs are required for new community water supply sources. We also have a patchwork of state rules that provide some protection for all community sources, such as UST/AST setbacks, and we have watershed-specific rules for half of the surface sources.
	http://www.des.state.nh.us/dwspp/
New Mexico	NM does not have any rules or state legislation related to Source Water Protection.
	http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/dwb/index.htm
North Carolina	The NC Source Water Assessment and Protection Program is within the Public Water Supply Section of the NC Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR). Our website is
	http://swap.deh.enr.state.nc.us/swap/
	While our program is a voluntary program, there are several regulations that provide a foundation of protection of our drinking water sources. First, our Public Water Supply Section operates under the SDWA. The rules governing public water supply system can be found at:
	http://www.deh.enr.state.nc.us/pws/rules/contents.htm
	A sister program within our department, the Division of Water Quality, provides basic protection of surface water and groundwater through their Water Supply Watershed Protection Program:
	http://h2o.enr.state.nc.us/wswp/index.html
	Groundwater Classification and Standards Rules:
	http://h2o.enr.state.nc.us/admin/rules/documents/WEBversioncomp2Lw-PFOAInterim_dec06.pdf
Ohio	There is no specific enabling legislation or rules for Ohio's Wellhead Protection/Source Water Protection program. A set of process documents lays out how the program is implemented; however, these process documents are designed for SWAP program staff and are not available on the internet. The process documents make reference to a number of technical guidance documents, however, which are available on the internet at
	http://www.epa.state.oh.us/ddagw/pdu/swap_guidance.html

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
	Also, we have worked with other programs and agencies to incorporate into their regulations special requirements for activities in source water protection areas. These usually take the form of siting prohibitions or higher engineering/operational standards. Examples include the rules for biosolids (OEPA, Division of Surface Water), various types of landfills (Division of Solid and Infectious Waste, OEPA, CAFOs (Department of Agriculture), and underground storage tanks (Dept. of Commerce).
	Our Source Water Protection web site is at:
	http://www.epa.state.oh.us/ddagw/pdu/swap.html
	and information about these rules is on this site at
	http://www.epa.state.oh.us/ddagw/Documents/regstable.pdf
South Dakota	There are no specific rules or legislation authorizing the source water protection program. The current rules authorize the wellhead protection program.
	http://www.state.sd.us/denr/DES/Ground/Sourcewater/sourcewater.htm
Tennessee	TCA 1200-5-1-.34
	http://www.state.tn.us/environment/dws/dwassess.shtml
	http://www.state.tn.us/environment/dws/
Texas	Currently there are no rules or regulations pertaining to source water protection. Texas is attempting to make source water protection mandatory for community water systems. Another option is to incorporate Source Water protection into our state's "Superior/Approved" water system program.
Utah	http://www.drinkingwater.utah.gov/source_protection_intro.htm
	http://www.rules.utah.gov/publicat/code/r309/r309-600.htm
	http://www.rules.utah.gov/publicat/code/r309/r309-605.htm
West Virginia	West Virginia Code, Section 16-1-9a "... to protect and prevent contamination of wellheads and well fields used by public water supplies so that contaminants do not reach a level which adversely affect the health of the consumer". General West Virginia SWAP website
	http://www.wvdhhr.org/oehs/eed/swap/
Wisconsin	The Wisconsin Dept. of Natural Resources has statutory authority to manage the waters of the state including both groundwater and surface water. Chapter NR 811 contains requirements for new community water supply systems. Section NR 811.16(5), Wisconsin Administrative Code, contains requirements for preparation of a wellhead protection plan. There is extensive information at
	http://dnr.wi.gov/org/water/dwg/gw/wellhead.htm
	http://dnr.wi.gov/org/water/dwg/swap/index.htm
Wyoming	no rules/legislation
	http://deg.state.wy.us/wqd/www/srf/Pages/SWAP/index.asp
	Please indicate below the guidance documents that are available to communities in your state wishing to develop and implement a source water protection program. Please provide a web link if these documents are not available through your general source water protection webpage.

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
Alaska	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Checklist for Local Wellhead Protection Program Approval, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Wellhead Protection Area Delineation Guidance, Contingency Plan Guidance, Public Education and Outreach Guidance
Arizona	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents
Arkansas	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Roles and Responsibilities Guidance, Contingency Plan Guidance, New Wells Guidance, Public Education and Outreach Guidance
Colorado	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Roles and Responsibilities Guidance, Wellhead Protection Area Management Guidance, Contingency Plan Guidance, Public Education and Outreach Guidance. Colorado has developed a source water protection DVD/CD toolkit available via a link on the SWAP website. This resource is provided to provide an instructional framework to complete a plan.
Delaware	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Wellhead Protection Area Delineation Guidance, Wellhead Protection Area Management Guidance, Source Water Guidance for Local Communities - Most documents for Delaware SWAPP are on our web site at (see publications section): http://www.wr.udel.edu/swaphome/index.html
Idaho	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Checklist for Local Wellhead Protection Program Approval, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Wellhead Protection Area Delineation Guidance, Wellhead Protection Area Management Guidance, Contingency Plan Guidance, New Wells Guidance. The information or guidance listed above is included in either the "Idaho Wellhead Protection Plan", "Idaho Source Water Assessment Plan" and/or "Protecting Drinking Water Sources In Idaho" These documents are all available on our webpage at: http://www.deq.idaho.gov/water/prog_issues/source_water/protection.cfm http://www.deq.idaho.gov/water/prog_issues/source_water/assessment.cfm
Kansas	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Checklist for Local Wellhead Protection Program Approval, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Wellhead Protection Area Delineation Guidance, Wellhead Protection Area Management Guidance, Contingency Plan Guidance, New Wells Guidance, Public Education and Outreach Guidance: http://www.kdheks.gov/waterwell/index.html http://www.kdheks.gov/nps/swap/
Louisiana	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Roles and Responsibilities Guidance, Wellhead Protection Delineation Guidance, Wellhead Protection Management Guidance, Contingency Plan Guidance, Public Education and Outreach Guidance. In Louisiana the term Source Water Protection Program (SWPP) has replaced Wellhead Protection Program for the most part except for Contingency Plan development
Maine	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Checklist for Local Wellhead Protection Program Approval, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, New Wells Guidance, Public Education and Outreach Guidance, Aquifer Test Requirements

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
Massachusetts	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents MassDEP provides numerous wellhead protection guidance documents, fact sheets and management tools), Checklist for Local Wellhead Protection Program Approval, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Wellhead Protection Area Delineation Guidance, Wellhead Protection Area Management Guidance, Contingency Plan Guidance, New Wells Guidance, Aquifer Test Requirements, Surface Water Supply Protection Documents, fact sheets, and guidance.
Michigan	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Checklist for Local Wellhead Protection Program Approval, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Roles and Responsibilities Guidance, Wellhead Protection Area Delineation Guidance, Wellhead Protection Area Delineation Guidance, Contingency Plan Guidance, New Wells Guidance, Public Education and Outreach Guidance, Low Tritium Wellhead Protection Program, Aquifer Test Requirements. http://www.michigan.gov/deq/0,1607,7-135-3313_3675_3695-50583--,00.html
Minnesota	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Checklist for Local Wellhead Protection Program Approval, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Roles and Responsibilities Guidance, Wellhead Protection Delineation Guidance, Wellhead Protection Management Guidance, Contingency Plan Guidance, New Wells Guidance, Public Education and Outreach Guidance, Low Tritium Wellhead Protection Program, Aquifer Test Requirements. MDH and MRWA are cooperating on populating the MRWA web site with education and outreach tools that public water suppliers can use to develop and implement WHP plans. The purpose is to consolidate materials so that a public water supplier can have one stop shopping for WHP materials. The site address is – http://www.mrwa.com/sourcewater.htm
	The MDH wellhead protection web site that has some guidance is – http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/eh/water/swp/whp/index.htm
Mississippi	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Public Education and Outreach Guidance
Missouri	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Roles and Responsibilities Guidance, Wellhead Protection Area Delineation Guidance, Wellhead Protection Area Delineation Guidance, Contingency Plan Guidance, New Wells Guidance, Public Education and Outreach Guidance
Montana	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Checklist for Local Wellhead Protection Program Approval, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Roles and Responsibilities Guidance, Wellhead Protection Delineation Guidance, Wellhead Protection Management Guidance, Contingency Plan Guidance, New Wells Guidance, Public Education and Outreach Guidance
Nebraska	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Checklist for Local Wellhead Protection Program Approval, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Wellhead Protection Area Delineation Guidance, Wellhead Protection Area Management Guidance Contingency Plan Guidance, New Wells Guidance, Public Education and Outreach Guidance

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
Nevada	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Checklist for Local Wellhead Protection Program Approval, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Wellhead Protection Area Delineation Guidance, Public Education and Outreach Guidance. The state provides technical assistance to all interested communities and for all programs developed with state grant funding, it is typical for the wellhead protection program manager to be included on the WHP Team and used as a resource in plan development and implementation. For informational purposes, NDEP will be updating these documents and creating some new ones (WHP ordinance guidance) under a new consultant contract in FY09.
	http://ndep.nv.gov/bwpc/docs/swpguidance_whpp_guide_rv6.pdf
	http://ndep.nv.gov/bwpc/docs/nvwphpdelineation.pdf
New Hampshire	Wellhead Protection Area Delineation Guidance, Wellhead Protection Area Management Guidance
New Mexico	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Wellhead Protection Area Management Guidance Public Education and Outreach Guidance
North Carolina	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Checklist for Local Wellhead Protection Program Approval, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Roles and Responsibilities Guidance, Wellhead Protection Area Delineation Guidance, Wellhead Protection Management guidance, Contingency Plan Guidance. All of the guidance checked above are in our Wellhead Protection Guide Book located at: http://swap.deh.enr.state.nc.us/swap/pages/guidebook.htm
Ohio	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Checklist for Local Wellhead Protection Program Approval, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Wellhead Protection Area Delineation Guidance, Wellhead Protection Management guidance, Contingency Plan Guidance, Public Education and Outreach Guidance. See our Web page. - question #4
South Dakota	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, New Wells Guidance
	http://www.state.sd.us/denr/des/waterrights/waterprg.htm
	http://www.state.sd.us/denr/DES/Ground/Databases.htm
Tennessee	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents
Texas	Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Contingency Plan Guidance. Best Management Practice Guidance Document
Utah	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Checklist for Local Wellhead Protection Program Approval, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Wellhead Protection Area Delineation Guidance, Wellhead Protection Management guidance, Contingency Plan Guidance. See our Web page. - All links are available there.
West Virginia	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, New Wells Guidance, Aquifer Test Requirements.
	http://www.wvdhhr.org/oehs/eed/i&cd/public-water-well.asp
Wisconsin	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents, Wellhead Protection Program Overview, Wellhead Protection Area Delineation Guidance. Contaminant Source Inventory Guidance, example ordinance document, Template for Preparing WHP Plans, WHP website and WHP video.
Wyoming	Wellhead Protection Program Guidance Documents

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
	What type of source water protection program training does your state sponsor for communities?
Alaska	Interactive CD ROM, Workshops/Training Sessions, Community Site Visits, Working with Local WHP teams
Arizona	Workshops/Training Sessions, Community Site Visits
Arkansas	Workshops/Training Sessions, Conferences, Community Site Visits, Working with Local WHP teams
Colorado	Interactive CD ROM, Workshops/Training Sessions, Conferences, Community Site Visits
Delaware	Workshops/Training Sessions, Community Site Visits, Conferences. The Delaware Source Water Citizens and Technical Advisory Committee meets quarterly and discusses new requirements, advances in research, local community forum, etc.
Idaho	Workshops/Training Sessions, Conferences, Community Site Visits, Working with Local WHP teams
Kansas	Internet, Conferences, Community Site Visits, Working with Local WHP teams
Louisiana	Workshops/Training Sessions, Community Site Visits, Working with Local WHP teams
Maine	Workshops/Training Sessions, Conferences, Community Site Visits, Working with Local WHP teams. Outreach to ~ 200 small systems with Maine Rural Water Association to identify abutters within the sanitary protection radius, provide ERP-source protection workbooks, and update potential threats
Massachusetts	Internet, Workshops/Training Sessions, Community Site Visits, Working with Local WHP teams
Michigan	Internet, Workshops/Training Sessions, Conferences, Community Site Visits, Working with Local WHP teams
Minnesota	Workshops/Training Sessions, Conferences, Community Site Visits, Working with Local Wellhead teams.
Mississippi	Workshops/Training Sessions, Community Site Visits
Missouri	Working with Local Wellhead teams
Montana	Interactive CD ROM, Workshops/Training Sessions, Conferences, Community Site Visits, Working with Local Wellhead teams.
Nebraska	Community Site Visits, Working with Local Wellhead teams. Wellhead Protection Network http://www.groundwater.org/pe/newhwp.html
Nevada	Workshops/Training Sessions, Conferences, Community Site Visits, Working with Local Wellhead teams.
New Hampshire	Workshops/Training Sessions, Conferences, Community Site Visits, Working with Local Wellhead teams.
New Mexico	Workshops/Training Sessions, Community Site Visits, Working with Local Wellhead teams.
North Carolina	Community Site Visits, Working with Local Wellhead teams.
Ohio	Internet, Interactive CD ROM, Workshops/Training Sessions, Community Site Visits, Working with Local WHP teams
South Dakota	Community Site Visits
Tennessee	Workshops/Training Sessions, Conferences, Community Site Visits
Texas	Conferences, Community Site Visits
Utah	Workshops/Training Sessions, Conferences, Community Site Visits
West Virginia	Internet, Workshops/Training Sessions, Conferences, Community Site Visits, Working with Local WHP teams. Sponsors training with the use of the internet, workshops, conferences, and community site visits.
Wisconsin	Providing information, answering questions, meeting with local representatives as requested, coordination with Wisconsin Rural Water Association.

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
Wyoming	None
	Describe how your state has linked source water protection and Phase II storm- water management requirements.
Alaska	No link at this time. We are just starting to discuss with the Division of Water (CWA Funding) how to better coordinate program overlap.
Arizona	N/A
Arkansas	Currently the programs are not linked however we have worked to coordinate our efforts with the Clean Water Act counterparts including those programs housed in the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality. This ongoing relationship has resulted in an official MOU regarding GIS data sharing and review of all permitted facilities within the state in regards to source water protection. Coordination with the Arkansas Natural Resources Commission to address Non Point Source Pollution is also a mainstay for our program and includes our annual participation in the Non Point Source Pollution Task Force.
Colorado	We have not linked the SWAP program and Phase II storm-water management requirements yet.
Delaware	The Delaware SWAPP is currently part of a review team for the new state stormwater regulations.
Idaho	We have not linked the source water program and phase II stormwater management, however, we do encourage communities to include stormdrain marking as part of their Drinking Water Protection Plan and DEQ also provides a storm drain marking toolkit for communities and we provide the storm drain markers. http://www.deq.idaho.gov/water/prog_issues/storm_water/storm_drain_marking.cfm
Kansas	If the source of the drinking water has a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) then they are considered a high priority TMDL. If there is a high priority TMDL then they are required to have a phase four permit. Part of the requirement of the phase four permit is to implement Best Management Practices to address the pollutant(s) and protect water quality.
Louisiana	The two aren't officially linked, however we do recommend speakers on various subjects to our local source water protection committees, including stormwater specialists. Our SWPP local committees are encouraged to mark stormwater drains with "Do Not Dump" markers provided by LDEQ.
Maine	WP worked with stormwater stakeholders to incorporate both ground and surface water source protection into DEP's chapter 500 regulations. http://www.maine.gov/dep/blwg/docstand/stormwater/rule500and502/500_502.htm
Massachusetts	Storm water management has always been a component of MassDEP's source water protection goals. Both the MA Surface Water Supply Protection Regulations and the Wellhead Protection Regulations include limits on impervious surface construction in drinking water supply areas. In addition, communities must install systems for artificial recharge that will not degrade drinking water quality. Phase II staff and source protection staff work together in the Drinking Water Program.
Michigan	Source Water Protection staff met with storm water phase II staff and identified similar components. Source water staff is able to work with communities through presentations, workshops and site visits to identify where connections can be made.
Minnesota	MDH staff worked with the MPCA to integrate SWP into the requirements for the preparation of Storm Water Pollution Prevention plans. Also, we have incorporated WHPAs into the state stormwater regulations and have developed guidance with MPCA relating to the placement and design of stormwater infiltration basins in WHPAs.
Mississippi	No link exists at this time.
Missouri	We have not.

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
Montana	Montana's Source Water Protection requirements and Phase II (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System - MS4) permit requirements are linked by the emphasis that these programs place on keeping contaminants from being discharged into waterways, especially those that supply drinking water to Montana communities. Also, both programs encourage the development and the use of best management practices to keep pollutants from being discharged into surface water that is the source of drinking water to public water supplies in Montana. Source water protection requirements and the Phase II permit requirements are also linked by the efforts to work with total maximum daily load requirements (TMDLs).
Nebraska	We have not.
Nevada	Currently, there is no formal process for linking these two programs at the State level. However, the two programs are administered within the same Bureau of Water Pollution Control. Therefore, there is opportunity to link these two programs, and we are exploring this as we are updating our source water protection program.
New Hampshire	In our proposed Alteration of Terrain rule amendments (applying to sites where 100,000 square feet are being disturbed and to sites where 50,000 sq ft of protected shoreland is being disturbed, there are setbacks for stormwater discharges and enhanced stormwater treatment requirements in WHPAs
New Mexico	No link at this time.
North Carolina	N/A
Ohio	We are pursuing this for the surface water systems in the Maumee River watershed, but are just getting started.
South Dakota	N/A
Tennessee	In the process of starting meetings.
Texas	Current source water assessments address storm-water runoff in a non-point source component. We are currently addressing the presence and validity of these permits in future surface water projects.
Utah	We have not done this directly.
West Virginia	SWAP staff meet with the WVDEP storm water staff to help identify key components in both the SWP and storm water program requirements. A recent EPA region III Source Water workshop in WV highlighted possible cross connections of these programs.
Wisconsin	Because of limited resources, there has not been an effort to link WHP and the Phase II stormwater management requirements.
Wyoming	The programs are not linked.
	How is watershed management plans developed at the local level? How do they incorporate source water protection?
Alaska	I'm unsure of how the plans are developed. It seems to be connected with local interest and 303b funds. Some communities have watershed management plans and other don't. We have been able to find out what the driving force is. The only overlap we have is where impaired water bodies, on the 303b list, also serve as a public drinking water source. At this time, there are no regulated drinking water sources within a designated impaired water body. I'm interested in learning more about Michigan's efforts but the link you provided doesn't appear to work for us.
Arizona	Measures and protective actions have not been captured and documented. Future plans to incorporate watershed activities with SWP.

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
Arkansas	The water utility is typically the spearhead of development of the watershed management plans assisted by environmental consultants, state and federal agencies, local watershed groups, and concerned citizens. Stakeholders work together to develop the watershed management plans. Since these plans are typically for public water supply watersheds the main goal is to protect the source water protection is automatically incorporated.
Colorado	Watershed management plans are developed by local watershed groups. We are encouraging the local watershed plan efforts to include source water protection and we are also looking at creative mechanisms to integrate the programs.
Delaware	Only 3 systems in Delaware rely on surface water for drinking water. Delaware agencies, NGO's and citizens participate in an interstate group for the watershed in which these are located. The SWAPP programs also has a member on that group. In addition, there is some involvement with the Delaware River Basin Commission on source water protection.
Idaho	Idaho has TMDL implementation plans that are developed by agencies, stakeholders and Watershed Advisory Groups. These implementation plans may include a source water protection component specific to a pollutant or water quality standard that is not being met, if drinking water is a designated beneficial use of that water source.
Kansas	The Kansas Department of Health and Environment has a watershed management section. This section manages the Source Water Protection program and the Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies(WRAPS). The WRAPS program is a stakeholder driven program and source water protection is folded into the program. Staff from the watershed management section and staff from the Kansas Rural Water Association work directly with communities. www.kswraps.org
Louisiana	We have a non-point source group that writes watershed implementation plans, but there are no such management plans at the local level that we are aware of. The non-point group has plans to encourage local groups to take actions to improve their water quality, but this hasn't come together yet. The SWPP is being melded into the watershed management and implementation plans.
Maine	Watershed management plans have been developed both by the MRWA source water outreach program and by U-Maine Extension watershed outreach. We work with both programs to provide technical assistance and guidance for protection surface supplies.
Massachusetts	MassDEP regulations require public water suppliers to develop Surface Water Supply Protection Plans (i.e. these are the same as watershed management plans). Public water suppliers must meet certain criteria in order to receive MassDEP approval for their protection plan. An approved protection plan includes incorporating specific source water protection tasks/measures. MassDEP provides water suppliers with guidance on developing protection plans.
Michigan	MDEQ has a watershed management program and is currently working on incorporation of Source Water Protection Concepts in Watershed Management plans. http://www.michigan.gov/deq/0,1607,7-135-3313_3687---,00.html
Minnesota	Watershed management plans are developed locally and approved by the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources. There is minimal coordination with intake protection because we are still developing this program.
Mississippi	Basin Management Teams use Source Water Protection for the three surface water systems in the state.
Missouri	Watershed management programs are administered by a different office, we try to coordinate to the extent possible.

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
Montana	Watershed management plans are developed by local watershed groups made up of interested parties including the affected public, local, & state officials, and tribal representatives. Local watershed groups incorporate Source water protection into the watershed management plan by helping to identify potential contaminant sources within the watershed. Watershed groups also hold Informational meetings to inform the public of water protection activities within the watersheds. The actual level of activity in Montana is quite low.
Nebraska	Community Based Planning is used to develop watershed and wellhead protection management plans. We have a guidance document to describe each of these processes. Since most of Nebraska's drinking water supplies are ground water based, watershed management plans are not as concerned about drinking water protection. However, quite often, a watershed plan will include a septic tank inspection and upgrade cost-share program.
Nevada	NDEP currently doesn't develop watershed plans but will begin evaluating this concept in the future. In urbanized areas, regional authorities incorporate the watershed management approach to protect source water from non-point source pollution in their NPDES stormwater programs (e.g., the Las Vegas Valley and the Truckee Meadows Regional Stormwater Programs). In rural areas, a number of Source Water Protection Plans (Watershed Management plans) were developed at the local level with the assistance of the Nevada Rural Water Association under a grant from the USDA. NDEP's SWP staff receive and review these plan to assist the State's coordination effort.
New Hampshire	A handful of watershed management plans have been developed by municipalities or water suppliers for their water supply sources, with the help of consultants or the state rural water association.
New Mexico	This is still in the planning stages.
North Carolina	Not sure what is meant by watershed management plans. In our Department there are several programs/divisions who develop watershed plans to address their specific programmatic goals. Specifically in our program, we work with local stakeholders to help them develop Source Water Protection Plans for their surface water sources. The planning process is very similar to the WHP planning process. Also, the Division of Water Quality develops watershed restoration plans that are designed to restore stream segments that are impaired. If the watershed also happens to be a public drinking water source, we try to participate in the planning process. Also within our department, the Ecosystem Enhancement Program develops Local Watershed Plans that are developed with local stakeholder involvement for watersheds that provide the best opportunity for protection and restoration work.
Ohio	In our source water protection planning guidance for surface water systems, we have encouraged the local source water protection teams to incorporate their efforts into a larger watershed management plan, where possible. This document is available on the internet at: http://www.epa.state.oh.us/ddagw/Documents/swap_sw_protplan_FINAL.pdf
	At this time, we are aware of one watershed management plan in southwest Ohio that is incorporating local source water protection concerns. However, that plan has not yet been sent to us for review and endorsement, so I cannot provide more detailed information about how it was developed.
South Dakota	Any watershed management plans are developed at the local level.
Tennessee	WP is only briefly mentioned in the watershed plans Tennessee is currently working with the water shed group to find a larger presence

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
Texas	Texas' source water protection program is available for assistance with any watershed management plan. Generally, we will focus our efforts on systems not currently involved in a similar protection project.
Utah	Surface water source protection is required for all surface water sources. WMP may include SP if the watershed is a surface water source. More often, the documents are separate.
West Virginia	The Clean Water Act (CWA) is administered through the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). SWAP staff participate in meetings with staff of WV DEP and the Watershed Management Framework committee as a planning tool for TMDL development and watershed planning within West Virginia. Encourage staff and local communities to participate with watershed management work groups that have common interests. Human health criterion standards for Category A (Water Supply-Public Water), are located in WV Title 47 Legislative Rules Department of Environmental Protection, Office of Water Resources Series 2 Requirements Governing Water Quality Standards.
Wisconsin	Watershed plans usually don't address source water protection.
Wyoming	Not done.
	What types of management strategies (i.e. local ordinances) are utilized in local source water protection programs? How are they implemented and enforced? Please provide a web link to local ordinances, if available.
Alaska	In Alaska, local ordinances protecting source water are few and far between. The City of Homer is our best example of a source water protection program. Enforcement occurs at the locals level. City of Homer is our best example of a source water protection program: http://clerk.ci.homer.ak.us/document/2159.htm
Arizona	Municipal ordinance
Arkansas	Arkansas has both wellhead protection ordinances as well as source water protection ordinances that are developed by the communities to fit there specific needs. These are enforced by the city or county or by whomever has jurisdiction.
Colorado	Municipal public water systems can adopt a local watershed protection ordinance through state statute 31-15-707. Many municipal public water suppliers in Colorado have exercised this right. This link indicates the systems that have municipal watershed protection ordinances: http://wccongress.org/documents/COLORADOMUNICIPALWATERSHEDPROTECTIONORDINANCES-HH12-19.doc
Delaware	See the Delaware SWAPP Web site for a listing of local ordinances. We are posting them as they become available. http://www.wr.udel.edu/swaphome/swpstatus.html
Idaho	Local Source Water Protection Programs/Plans are encouraged to implement both regulatory (ordinances) and non-regulatory management strategies (education/outreach, BMP's). Local governments have the authority to develop local ordinances for source water protection. They are implemented and enforced by that local government.
Kansas	City planning, zoning, land use around intakes and wellheads, education and information to the communities.
Louisiana	We have a model ground water protection ordinance that we present to the appropriate governing authorities and encourage them to adopt it. This ordinance has a penalty/punishment section and is enforceable by the governing body. A copy is available on our website.

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
Maine	Variable, depending on the town. We encourage watershed management ordinances, based on the RWA model, and wellhead ordinances based on the model posted on our website.
Massachusetts	MassDEP requires public water suppliers to work with their municipality in adopting local water supply protection controls. Municipalities may adopt zoning bylaws/ordinances, general bylaws/ordinances or health regulations. Local controls must prohibit specific land uses. Examples of the land uses that must be prohibited include: hazardous waste generation, storage or disposal; petroleum bulk stations; uncontained animal manure, fertilizer and deicing chemicals; landfills; cemeteries; junkyards; large impervious surfaces; permanent earth removal activities and others .
	In addition to local controls, many communities implement Best Management Practices, develop inspection programs, and create structural features aimed at mitigating releases (drainage, berms, secondary containment etc).
	Implementation of local controls varies among communities. One approach that is widely used is the use of an internal checklist to ensure each local board has an opportunity to comment on projects proposed in water supply areas. Enforcement is carried out by the responsible board or individual (i.e. building inspector, health agent, zoning official).
Michigan	Communities have used zoning, best management practices, local business training, and environmental permit check lists. Enforcement of local ordinances happens at the municipal level.
Minnesota	This is a tough question to answer because there is a broad range of land-use regulatory and technical assistance activities that MDH has been integrating WHP. These are tailored to meet the needs of public water suppliers and the interest that local governments have with enforcing existing ordinances or with developing new ones. Examples include 1) feedlot permitting, 2) sand and gravel mining permit requirements, 3) plan approval for the design of stormwater ponds, 4) local environmental review of proposed land-use changes in WHPAs, 5) assigning priority for cost sharing money for sealing abandoned wells in WHPAs, 6) assigning priority to WHP in county water management plans, and 7) assigning priority to landowners in WHPAs to promote Farm Bill support programs such as the Conservation Reserve Program.
Mississippi	Some local ordinances are used. No web links are available.
Missouri	We encourage local ordinances.
Montana	Local zoning ordinances have been adopted in a few MT communities to keep certain activities out of water protection areas for public water supplies.
Nebraska	Most villages and municipalities have at least a 1000 ft setback distance ordinance for their wells, which dictates the type of activities which may occur inside that area. Some have more than that. See this website for some examples www.deq.state.ne.us (publications on the left side of main menu, then Wellhead Protection, then Reports, then Contaminant Source Management Options)

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
Nevada	There are a few communities in NV who have developed wellhead protection ordinances and the State supports these efforts. This has been a challenging effort mainly due to the fact that although there is local authority to do so, there is not federal or state legislation that mandates local ordinances to include source water protection to provide enforcement and support for these local governments. So, there has been some resistance and concern that local communities could be held financially accountable for "inverse condemnation" or "wrongful taking" of land based on zoning changes or limited uses of the land that is impacted by a source water protection ordinance. In addition, this is a fairly new strategy for NV and our program has identified a need for, and is in the process of, developing guidance for local communities to consider the effectiveness and commitment (resource dedication) to the ordinance depending upon its requirements or restrictions. For example, if a community chooses to use a source prohibition ordinance within designated wellhead protection areas versus land use restrictions or a combination of the two, there are pros and cons and commitments specific to each for establishment and enforcement measures that will be nec
New Hampshire	The vast majority use non-regulatory strategies - education and/or voluntary BMP inspections. Some have local regulatory authority to enforce state BMP rules through the groundwater reclassification process. Seventy municipalities have groundwater/aquifer/wellhead protection zoning, usually involving land use restrictions.
New Mexico	There are only a couple of water systems with ordinances. They are implemented and enforced at the local level.
North Carolina	As mentioned in #4, the Water Supply Watershed Protection Program provides a basic level of protection for our surface water sources by requiring a local ordinance to be put in place for all water supply watersheds. However, these local ordinances are very basic and make up only one category of possible SWP management strategies. Other examples include land acquisition/conservation, implementation of agricultural and/or stormwater BMPs, removal of potential contamination sources, educational initiatives, etc. Communities only pursue augmenting their existing local ordinances when it will have definite impact and when there is political support to pass such ordinances. Zoning, buffer ordinances, and stormwater ordinances are the most common examples. Typically, a city or county government will fund a position to implement and enforce the ordinances.
Ohio	A number of Ohio cities and villages, especially in southwest Ohio, have passed local ordinances related to source water protection. Most of them focus on limiting the amounts of "restricted materials", which are defined in the ordinance. Some types of uses are typically prohibited within the protection area. Entities already located there are grandfathered but must submit an inventory of their restricted substances. Most of the ordinances specify a local enforcing authority, often located in a city planning department. Copies of available local ordinances are at: http://www.epa.state.oh.us/ddagw/pdu/swap_ordinances.html
	Generally, in Ohio, education appears to be the most popular and acceptable of all types of protective strategies. A "minimal" protection plan, which might be endorsable for a system with no significant contaminant sources, no water quality issues, and a low susceptibility, would agree to promote source water protection in the annual CCR (education) and would have a contingency plan that includes measures for addressing contamination of the source water and some planning for a scenario where the current source water could not be used.

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
South Dakota	Several counties and municipalities in South Dakota have adopted or are in the process of adopting ordinances establishing wellhead protection districts. Authorized by SDCL 7-18-20 and 9-12-17, counties and municipalities may adopt ordinances to protect public groundwater supplies from pollution. Ordinances may also be enacted which establish wellhead protection areas; zone to protect such areas from pollution, and monitor and control activities and sources of potential or actual pollution within the areas. Counties and municipalities may enter into agreements with the state and with other political subdivisions to implement and enforce a wellhead protection program.
	The ordinances may be based upon adopted wellhead protection areas. The county or municipality may place restrictions upon the land overlying the mapped shallow aquifers. For example, a county may require new landfills or chemical storage facilities be located outside the wellhead protection area unless a conditional use permit has been granted by the county.
Tennessee	local ordinances
Texas	Management strategies are mostly in the form of local ordinances. We are currently in the process of investigating the enforcement of these ordinances and providing the results via the web.
Utah	See web site for link to and summary of ordinances at top of page.
West Virginia	Use of zoning is limited in West Virginia. Best management practices have been used, etc.
Wisconsin	Management strategies can include education, purchasing property, working with farmers in wellhead protection areas, working with potential contaminant sources in wellhead protection areas, adopting ordinances, working with adjacent local jurisdictions, participating in the Groundwater Guardian program, installing monitoring wells, exploring the use of the Conservation Reserve Program in wellhead protection areas, and working on Clean Sweep programs to collect hazardous waste. Example ordinances are available online at
	http://dnr.wi.gov/org/water/dwg/gw/whp/whp_orde.pdf
Wyoming	Very few of our communities have chosen to use ordinances, how they are implemented and how successful they are/will be is unknown.
	What types of local outreach and education strategies are utilized in communities?
Alaska	Not known.
Arizona	varies
Arkansas	Public school programs, speakers bureau, home owner workshops, volunteer monitoring programs, stream clean ups, watershed appreciation days, movie trailers, signage, websites.
Colorado	Communities have used informational flyers, door to door direct contact, newspapers, and presentations as outreach and education strategies.
Delaware	Mainly done by the State DNREC and the Delaware Rural Water Association. This will be an evolving effort as assessments are done and more attention is paid to local and state-level protection efforts.
Idaho	Storm drain marking, signs, brochures, booths at community events, presentations at public meetings, newspaper articles, etc.
Kansas	Three brochures have been created to be handed out water festivals, WRAPS meeting, communities events throughout the state of Kansas. Presentations about Kansas source water protections are presented to rural water committees, state conferences, water festivals and wellhead protection committees.

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
	http://www.kdheks.gov/nps/swap/SWPBrochure.pdf
	http://www.kdheks.gov/nps/swap/SWPP_Brochure_Home.pdf
	http://www.kdheks.gov/nps/swap/SWPP_Brochure_Ag.pdf
Louisiana	We present our information to students at career fairs, science fairs, 4-H groups, classrooms. We also present to civic groups and other various environmental education events, as well as publish articles in the newspaper, appear on television and radio shows. Local SWPP committees that we form compile information on Used Oil Recycling Centers for distribution to various media outlets. The committee members visit potential sources of contamination facilities in protection areas with BMPs for that facility.
Maine	Southern Maine communities have been working with a program developed by the Wells NERR "Protecting our Children's Water", which we are looking for opportunities to place in new communities. We also support Maine NEMO as a source water protection outreach tool.
Massachusetts	Methods of outreach and education also vary. Some communities hold annual water supply protection events at their town hall or local DPW; others communities provide water quality information along with the customer's water bill; and others provide source protection and drinking water information through their schools.
Michigan	Communities have used placemats, bookmarks, pencils, movie trailer advertisement, signage, school and community presentations, teacher trainings, and water festivals.
Minnesota	This varies a lot but the most commonly used strategies are continuing with their wellhead team, focusing educational materials on specific property owners, holding annual information meetings (free lunch or dinner) with land owners, using county SWCD or FSA offices to work with land owners, holding children's water festivals, placing WHPA signs along roads and streets, annual briefing for the city council, and meeting one-on-one with property owners.
Mississippi	Communities use the educational materials that we give them during the site visit.
Missouri	Missouri Rural Water Association formerly had a contract to assist. No contract in place, currently, for on-site assistance.
Montana	MT DEQ SWP staff; provide technical assistance and training seminars to communities for source water protection planning.
Nebraska	meetings, posters, grant funded activities, water bill inserts
Nevada	Nevada has numerous venues for outreach to communities on source water protection. Many communities have their own outreach activities by way of mailings to their customers, holding earth day events where the local community is educated on source water protection and "give aways" (magnets, pencils, posters, etc.) are distributed with their source water protection goals advertised. There are other service providers like Nevada Rural Water Association, Rural Community Assistance Corporation, the University Cooperative Extension, and other watershed groups who coordinate within the state to target communities for school presentations, water model demonstrations, and community events that promote source water protection.
New Hampshire	Most common is period mailings to residents of wellhead protection areas. Some have workshops.
New Mexico	Knowledge of these local outreach activities is limited. Education usually involves the posting of signs and discussion during meetings. Most I'm aware of have been incorporated into other community environment/water related events.

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
North Carolina	Outreach, awareness, and SWP promotion have occurred through regular press releases, water bill inserts, and information in local newsletters. Informational brochures and our SWAP reports are distributed to stakeholder groups and local government officials as source water protection planning is initiated.
Ohio	Here are the most popular: Schools agree to incorporate ground water and local source water information into their science classes; presentations by Ohio EPA staff and county Source Water Environmental Education Teams (SWEETs) using a sand tank model; tours of the local water treatment plant; Children's Water Festivals in some municipalities (with Dayton's being the most impressive); presentation of Ohio EPA's Wellhead Protection video; distribution of specific educational brochures (e.g., "how to maintain your septic tank") to specific groups; installation of Drinking Water Protection signs where roadways traverse the protection area.
South Dakota	Some public water systems have posted signage to delineate their groundwater protection areas.
Tennessee	Varies for each community.
Texas	Outreach and education activities are designed to address the most threatening activities based on the results of source water assessments. These activities have included posting signs, incorporating SWP in school curriculum and boater education.
Utah	Usually just simple public education efforts.
West Virginia	Developing signage, brochures, pamphlets, etc.
Wisconsin	Public meetings, newspaper articles, inserts in utility bills, participation in the Groundwater Guardian program, working with farmers in wellhead protection areas, working with potential contaminant sources in wellhead protection areas, etc.
Wyoming	WY Rural Water used to have 2 circuit riders that devoted their time to Source Water Protection and Wellhead Protection, but their funding was cut.
Describe how local health departments are involved with source water protection programs.	
Alaska	Not known.
Arizona	LHDs are currently not involved.
Arkansas	In Arkansas the Wellhead Protection and Source Water Protection Programs are housed in the Engineering Section, Environmental Health Branch, Center for Local Public Health, Arkansas Department of Health.
Colorado	The local health departments have been very involved in many of the source water protection planning efforts. They have typically attended the meetings and have also implemented septic system education.
Delaware	The DNREC and the DHSS Office of Drinking Water are beginning to work on database coordination. Our agencies recently signed a MOU in which DNREC and DHSS have agreed to implement a system for DHSS to notify DNREC of public well, half or multiple below MCL, VOC contaminant levels hits. The system will notify the parties noted in the document of the contaminant hit via email. The database will be evaluated to determine if preemptive investigation is warranted by a DAWM branch in association with DWR and DHSS.
Idaho	Health Districts offer technical assistance and information to small PWS developing protection plans. They also offer technical assistance and education for septic systems and private wells. The level of participation is dependent on the individual Health District, each having different priorities and available resources.

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
Kansas	One hundred and two out of one hundred and five counties are involved in the Local Environmental Protection Program or (LEPP) in the state of Kansas. The LEPP emphasize the importance of wastewater and private well water codes, to be developed and administered by county health departments and other local authorities. Contact for the (LEPP) Sheryl Ervin Environmental Scientist (785) 296-8038 http://www.kdheks.gov/nps/lepp/
Louisiana	Regional Health Department personnel are always encouraged to participate on our local committees but their level of participation depends on the individual and/or the specific office. In some parishes DHH is stretched thin, overworked, and understaffed. In other parishes DHH has proved instrumental in coordinating participation from local water offices and providing speakers for committee meetings. DHH provides DEQ with updates of their comprehensive database as needed.
Maine	Maine is in the process of re-energizing a regional health officer initiative. We are participating in this, and working with selected health officers to see how best to incorporate source protection into their work. Links are being developed to the "healthy Maine Communities" program, funded with Tobacco Settlement funds.
Massachusetts	Most MA Boards of Health have adopted some of the land use prohibitions cited in the MA Surface Water Supply Protection Regulations and/or Wellhead Protection Regulations. Typical activities addressed by boards of health are floor drain discharges, septic systems, and hazardous material/waste generation and disposal. Additionally, many Boards of Health implement local inspection programs and visit facilities to provide assistance and ensure compliance.
Michigan	As the program progresses we are reaching out to local health departments (LHDs). WHP teams usually have a representative from the LHD.
Minnesota	Minimal involvement. Most often we see involvement by county environmental services staff or SWCD staff.
Mississippi	They are involved indirectly with septic tank siting regulations.
Missouri	They are curious.
Montana	A copy of each completed Source Water Delineation and Assessment Report is sent to the appropriate health department. Local/ County Health Departments provide information and conduct joint training with MT Source Water Protection Program personnel. A "county packet" including map showing PWS locations and summary of PCSs was sent to each county HD..
Nebraska	It is variable. We have only had local health departments statewide for a couple years. They are for the most part not involved, though we have tried to get them interested. We do have 23 Natural Resources Districts whose main duties are protection of soil and water, mainly ground water. Several of them have received 319 grants to keep a staff person doing WHP, then kept them on when the grant ended.
Nevada	Nevada is set up somewhat differently compared to other States in that there are not local public health departments (at the county level) with the exception of the two most populous counties. In addition, our Source Water Protection staff are part of our Bureau of Water Pollution Control (BWPC) which coordinates with the Bureau of Safe Drinking Water (BSDW, formerly a program within the Bureau of Health Protection Services). The BHPS currently oversees the single family small domestic septic system program, whereas, the BWPC oversees the larger commercial and industrial individual septic systems. Local WHP teams are encouraged to invite representatives from local health departments as well as State Bureaus to be on their teams or for coordination efforts. There is no formal requirement in the State's WHP guidance at this time.
New Hampshire	Rarely; they sometimes get involved in conducting BMP inspections.

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
New Mexico	Local health departments are not usually involved in the source water protection programs
North Carolina	To date, local health departments rarely participate.
Ohio	Municipalities are advised to seek assistance from the county health department when there are concerns about effects on source water from small system (domestic) sewage, because in Ohio this is under the jurisdiction of the health departments.
South Dakota	N/A
Tennessee	Not involved at this time.
Texas	Local health departments are invited to participate in source water protection programs. In Texas county health departments regulate septic systems, so they are called upon to assist with these potential sources of contamination.
Utah	Mostly they are not, but we are doing outreach regarding GIS data and overlap with planning issues.
West Virginia	Local teams usually have a representative from the LHD.
Wisconsin	There may be efforts by local health departments but we are not aware of any.
Wyoming	not involved, not even aware
	What methods do you use to determine if source water protection programs are effective?
Alaska	We determine our effectiveness on EPA's Strategic Goal F. The number of public water systems and population served by a substantially implemented Drinking Water Protection Plan. We have met the goal for population but fall way short on the number of systems.
Arizona	case-by-case basis. Strategies for SWP include: adopted written strategies; public education & outreach; adopted written rules, ordinances, policies, resolutions, or laws; protective actions taken by various entities independent of a written strategies; and investigation and/or remediation of current contamination.
Arkansas	Based on the level of implementation, that is to say if the system is determined to meet our definition of substantial implementation then they are considered to have an effective program.
Colorado	We are still in the early stages of protection plan development, but the primary measure of effective plans has been reviewing the action plans created by the steering committees. This give us and indication of what BMP have been implemented. We will likely do some survey in the future also.
Delaware	We use our state definition for substantial implementation. Real effectiveness is not presently measured
Idaho	Last year we sent out a post card with a survey to all communities that have a certified DWPP to find out if the management plan is being implemented, what activities are being implemented, and what the barriers were to implementation. We plan on continuing this survey and spending more time assisting systems with implementation efforts.
Kansas	Under development
Louisiana	We have several measures of success:
	1) Number of committee visits with BMPs to potential sources of contamination located near water wells/intakes, as assessed in the SWAP protection area.
	2) Success rate of ground water protection ordinance passage.
	3) Feedback from surveys.
	4) Number of attendees at local committee meetings.

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
	5) Number of student/civic groups presented to.
	6) Completion of Contingency Plans by water systems.
	7) Amount of repair and replacement of on site sewage systems in watersheds draining to surface source waters that showed impairment due to fecal coliform. (Using federal 319 Grant Funds on a cost share basis) Monitor water quality before and after BMPs implemented.
Maine	Good question: we're working on that, and are interested in others approaches.
Massachusetts	Through surveys, questions on the various annual water supply system forms, workshops and meetings with water suppliers, and through site inspections. MassDEP's Drinking Water Program also tracks (via database and files) municipalities and public water systems that have successfully adopted local protection controls and protection plans that meet MassDEP regulations and guidance criteria.
Michigan	Communities within Michigan have used general public surveys, and also counted the number of website hits. Source Water Staff review and approve deliverables submitted under the Wellhead protection Program and have also approved several SWIPP's (at this time, there is no grant funding available for SWIPP's).
Minnesota	Seeing reductions in contaminant levels (mostly nitrate nitrogen) in wells; tracking that plans are actually being implemented; having the public water supplier call us when they have questions about potential contamination threats to their wells. Also, we have public water suppliers address potential contamination threats without having formal WHP plans.
Mississippi	Technical analysis of geohydrologic confinement and potential contaminant source analysis are used
Missouri	We ask to PWS's to indicate how they intend to evaluate/assess the effectiveness of their plan.
Montana	Adoption of zoning ordinances to keep potential contaminant sources out protection areas for public water supply wells/intakes demonstrates an effective SWP Program.
Nebraska	No answer
Nevada	State WHPP staff review and endorse local WHP plans that meet state requirements. State staff also tracks implementation status of local WHP Plans as well as SWP plans developed by NvRWA. The State's WHPP program manager is also identified as a member of State funded wellhead protection planning teams; and contacts communities with endorsed plans to follow up on progress made, management activities that have been implemented and for regular updates. The state is currently in the process of evaluating the overall program effectiveness and will soon be moving forward with updating the State's program. The state and local source water protection programs are considered dynamic and should be updated every 2 to 4 years or if a major event occurs that impacts the plans.
New Hampshire	We usually judge according to the strategies they employ, rather than the results.
New Mexico	Source Water Protection programs are evaluated to determine substantial implementation per state definition. Professional judgment is utilized based on the abilities/resources of the water system in relation to the Source Water Protection activities undertaken by the water systems.
North Carolina	We view successful progress if communities develop comprehensive SWP plans and/or if BMPs are implemented within our drinking water assessment areas. Local communities evaluate their success individually. This typically does not involve quantitative analysis. For instance, if a protection strategy is to enhance stream buffers, and that objective is accomplished, then the activity is usually deemed successful regardless of any measured changes in water quality variables.

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
Ohio	In 2007 we sent out a "baseline" survey to our community systems, to find out what strategies they are implementing, and entered the responses into an electronic database. We had an 85% response rate. Our intent is to follow up about every three years, to track progress (or lack thereof), possibly coupled with some limited on-site visits to verify the responses. From these responses we have gotten anecdotal information about effectiveness. An article on source water 'success stories', culled from these surveys, is available at: http://www.epa.state.oh.us/ddagw/Documents/SWAP%20Newsletter.pdf
South Dakota	SD has conducted surveys of various PWSS's to discuss SWP
Tennessee	Completion of plan.
Texas	Texas' definition of substantial implementation of SWP includes: 1) ground-truthing of potential sources of contamination, 2) develop/maintain a contingency plan, and 3) implementation of one or more best management practices, approved by TCEQ.
Utah	updates are required
West Virginia	Send a SWAP survey every two years to community water systems - requesting SWAP updates, current implementation projects, potential contaminant source inventory changes, etc.
Wisconsin	Either checking with the municipality or the Wisconsin Dept. of Natural Resources Water Supply Engineer who inspects the municipal water supply system.
Wyoming	If a community develops one, and reviews/updates it every 2 yrs, that is all we track.
	Are communities required to update approved source water protection programs and if they are, how frequently are they required to do so?
Alaska	No Answer
Arizona	No. Recommend in source water protection plan guidelines to establish an interval to revisit and update the plan.
Arkansas	Since the program is voluntary there are no required updates. We do however suggest updating the contaminant source inventories every three to four years.
Colorado	They are not required to update the plans, but we do encourage annual reviews and action plans.
Delaware	No
Idaho	Since source water protection is voluntary, they are not required to update their plans, however, for their plan to remain state certified it must be updated every five years.
Kansas	No, communities are not required to update approved source water protection plans, but we encourage them to update plans if there are any changes made and review plans every two years.
Louisiana	No, they aren't required to, but we are assisting them with updates as we work through the state.
Maine	Not Yet.
Massachusetts	Source water protection plans must be updated every 3-5 years.
Michigan	No, communities are not required to update their approved source water protection programs, but we encourage them to do so every 5 years and to update their contaminant source inventory every three.
Minnesota	Yes. A public water supplier must update its WHP plan every 10 years starting on the 8 th year following MDH approval. Also, MDH may require that a plan be updated when a municipality adds a well to its water supply system.

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
	We also implement WHP as part of the sanitary survey process for transient noncommunity systems. Recommendations or orders for correcting risks that potential contamination sources present to a well are included in the sanitary survey report to the public water supplier with follow up by noncommunity staff.
Mississippi	The state up-dates the SWAP reports as needed.
Missouri	Every 4 years.
Montana	The MT SWP Plan describes a requirement of an annual review and re-submission to MT DEQ SWP Section every 5 years. However, MT did not set-aside funds for this task and are not formally completing updates at this time .
Nebraska	There is no requirement. We suggest every 5 years.
Nevada	WHP Plans are updated as new information becomes available or new sources are installed or if any other significant activity occurs within a community that may impact the Plan. Each State-endorsed plan is required to have a schedule for updates and the state does track progress and surveys communities typically 2 years after a plan has been developed to see what implementation activities have taken place.
New Hampshire	Both the community systems with mandatory SWPPs and the systems voluntarily participating in order to qualify for chemical monitoring waivers need to update their inventories of potential contamination sources every three years.
New Mexico	They are not required to update their programs. This is a voluntary program.
North Carolina	They are not required to update. However, continued priority consideration for our low interest loan programs is not extended to communities who do not update and/or provide evidence of implementation.
Ohio	We do not require this. We do encourage the systems to conduct updates every five years or so or whenever there are significant changes in source water usage or the local contaminant sources or the community leadership that would affect the plan.
South Dakota	N/A
Tennessee	By regulation they need to update every year.
Texas	Communities are not required to update SWP programs. Source water assessment are scheduled to be completed every seven years.
Utah	Every 6 years.
West Virginia	No, it's voluntary. Communities are not required to update their approved source water protection programs. Updates are acquired by sending a SWAP survey every two years to community water systems - requesting SWAP updates, current implementation projects, potential contaminant source inventory changes. Also, a general review (update) is completed when a sanitary survey is performed.
Wisconsin	A community water system is not required to update their WHP plan. A municipal system would need to develop a WHP plan if it wanted to install a new well. In that case, it might update a wellhead protection plan for existing wells to include the new well.
Wyoming	Every 2 yrs.
	What do you perceive as the major barriers to source water protection implementation or source water protection in general?

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
Alaska	Lack of available funding, Lack of personnel resources, Local politics
Arizona	Lack of available funding, Lack of personnel resources
Arkansas	Lack of available funding, Lack of personnel resources, Local politics
Colorado	Lack of personnel resources, Local politics
Delaware	Lack of information, Lack of personnel resources, Lack of community involvement, Local politics
Idaho	Lack of personnel resources, Lack of community involvement, Local politics
Kansas	Lack of available funding, Lack of personnel resources, Lack of community involvement, local politics
Louisiana	Lack of personnel resources, Local politics
Maine	Lack of available funding, Local politics
Massachusetts	Lack of available funding, Lack of personnel resources, Local politics
Michigan	Lack of available funding, Lack of personnel resources, Local politics
Minnesota	No answer
Mississippi	Lack of available funding, Lack of personnel resources, Lack of community involvement
Missouri	Lack of available funding, Lack of personnel resources
Montana	Lack of available funding, Lack of community involvement, Local politics
Nebraska	politics
Nevada	Lack of available funding, Lack of information, Lack of personnel resources, Lack of community involvement, local politics
New Hampshire	Lack of community involvement, local politics
New Mexico	Lack of personnel resources, Lack of community involvement, Local politics
North Carolina	Lack of available funding, Lack of community involvement
Ohio	Lack of available funding, Lack of personnel resources
South Dakota	Lack of available funding
Tennessee	Lack of available funding, Lack of information, Lack of personnel resources, Lack of technical assistance, Lack of community involvement, local politics
Texas	Lack of available funding, Lack of information, Lack of community involvement, local politics
Utah	Lack of available funding, Lack of information, Lack of personnel resources, Lack of technical assistance, Lack of community involvement, local politics
West Virginia	Local politics
Wisconsin	Lack of personnel resources, Lack of technical assistance, Lack of community involvement
Wyoming	Lack of available funding, Lack of information, Lack of personnel resources, Lack of technical assistance, Lack of community involvement, local politics
	Approximately, what percentage of your state's population relies on community ground water supply wells and what percentage rely on surface water intake supplies? What percentages of each type have approved source water protection programs?
Alaska	Ground water: 50% of population, 87% of all public water systems
	Surface Water: 50% of population, 13% of all public water systems.

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
Arizona	
	AZ has 1600 Public Water Systems. (54 PWS are surface water systems).
	800 are Community Water Systems.
	Of the CWS, 761 are ground water and 39 are surface water systems.
Arkansas	61% of the population relies on groundwater.
	39% of the population relies on surface water.
Colorado	86% of Colorado's population relies on surface water supplies. 14% relies on ground water sources. However, approximately 80% of our public water suppliers are ground water systems. They just tend to serve smaller populations. Currently, we have 27 surface water protection plans in development or completed and 39 ground water protection plans. The relative percentages are 6.7% of surface water systems and 2.3% of ground water systems. Since Colorado's protection planning program is fairly new we expected these number to increase significantly in 2008.
Delaware	1. Approximately 50 - 50 but the percentage of ground water based systems is increasing as the surface water available is at its maximum; 2. We will shortly be at 100% for surface water population and 50% ground water.
Idaho	Approximately 96% of Idaho citizens rely on ground water for their drinking water. The remaining 4% rely on surface water sources. As of last year, 116 systems (15% of community PWS and 22% of the population) had developed a certified Drinking Water Protection Plan. (We do not have those numbers divided into GW and SW sources). We plan to revise our definitions of protection and substantial implementation this year to broaden our efforts and focus on more local government involvement. Our current definition only recognizes protection plans for individual PWSs.
Kansas	7% of the population relies on surface water
	33% of the population relies on groundwater
	5 - Surface
	94 - Ground
Louisiana	Approximately 70% of our state relies on ground water and 30% surface water. 20% of community water systems have approved ground water protection plans and 2% have approved surface water protection plans.
Maine	population served: 14% community groundwater 35% community surface water
	protected: 75% gw pop, 35% gw systems 86% sw pop, 62% sw systems
Massachusetts	Approximately 28% of the population relies on public groundwater and 72% on surface water.
	100% of all MA communities with public drinking water supplies have some type of source protection in place (such as local controls, source protection plans, water supply land ownership, or inspection programs).
	52% of the public water systems with surface water sources have approved Surface Water Protection Plans. 55% of public water systems with community wells (serving municipalities) have local controls that comply with MassDEP Wellhead Protection Regulations.
Michigan	45% of the population relies on groundwater.
	55% of the population relies on surface water.

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
	44% of groundwater supplies have an approved program.
	5% of surface water supplies have an approved program.
Minnesota	50% of the population relies on communities using groundwater.
	30% of the population relies on communities using surface water.
	20% of the population relies on private wells
	14% of groundwater supplies have a protection program.
	0% of surface water supplies have a protection program.
Mississippi	Ninety percent of the population relies on groundwater and ten percent on surface water. Thirty percent of the groundwater source water protection programs are approved and all of the surface water protection plans are approved.
Missouri	Our major population centers rely on surface water. 90% of our PWS's are groundwater systems, though. We have had minimal participation with our program. Missouri has had a WHPP in place since 1994, so groundwater systems have had more assistance, in general.
Montana	Approximately 97% of Montana's population relies on GW and 3% relies on surface water for drinking water. Of these percentages, < 1% of GW and 10% of SW have certified source water protection plans.
Nebraska	65% rely on community ground water public water supply wells, 35% rely on surface water intakes -- however, 95% of systems are ground water based and 5% are surface water or part surface water/groundwater.
	13% gw systems have approved WHP plans, 0 sw systems have approved source water protection plans
Nevada	Based on data listed in the State SDWIS database (as of April 2008):
	12% of the population relies on groundwater (GW source only).
	88% of the population relies on surface water (systems which use either surface water source or a combination surface and groundwater sources)..
	10.6% of groundwater supplies have an approved WHP program.
	10.5% of surface water supplies have an approved SWPP
	The above numbers may not correctly reflect the actual percentage of population served by groundwater. Three of our largest PWSs (serving 1.8 million people out of a total of 2.5 million people served by the State's PWSs) use both surface and groundwater sources. These systems are classified in SDWIS as surface water (SW) systems. However, it is understood that ground water makes up the smaller percentages (12 to 15%) of water served by these systems. Also some of the approved WHP plans were developed for system(s) that utilize both ground and surface water sources. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.
New Hampshire	About 40% surface water or surface and groundwater, and about 24% public groundwater and 35% private wells. Among community systems, 91% of the groundwater systems have initial implementation and 35% have substantial; while 87% of the surface (and surface plus ground) systems have initial and 77% substantial.
New Mexico	Approximately 86% GW, 14% SW at this time. This will change dramatically due to the largest water system in the state being reclassified to SW by next year. When this happens the percentages will be approximately 50/50

50 State SWP Survey

State	Answers
North Carolina	Our very approximate estimate is that 63% of our population is served by Community Surface Water systems and 18% is served by community Groundwater systems. 1.3% of the citizens served by community surface water systems, receive their water from a source that has a protection plan. 42.7% of the citizens served by community groundwater systems receive their water from a source that has a protection plan.
Ohio	Approximately 70% of Ohio's population of 10 million that relay on community public water system depend on surface water sources (or a combination of surface water and ground water) and 30% solely on ground water.
	See attached table for percentages of public water systems substantially implementing the source water program in Ohio. Note the statistics included for surface water sources in the attached table with source water protection plans (aka WHP plans) are either combined SW/GW sources or ground water systems that are designated under the influence of surface water. In Ohio, these public water systems are reported to U.S. EPA as a surface water source.
South Dakota	Community public water systems: 42% groundwater 26% surface water. Combined SW and GW - 32%. South Dakota does not formally approve source water protection programs. However, approximately 47 (10% of the groundwater based systems) have incorporated some sort of protection program
Tennessee	4,136,555 Tennesseans rely on Surface Water 1,580,610 Tennesseans rely on Ground Water about 95% of plans are current. All were approved.
Texas	45% of the population relies on groundwater.
	55% of the population relies on surface water.
	31% of groundwater supplies have an approved program.
	9% of surface water supplies have an approved program.
Utah	Something like 98% of our population get their water from community systems, probably 90% include surface water (the main metro areas all use surface water sources), and about 95% have approved source protection plans/programs
West Virginia	16 % of the population relies on groundwater
	65 % of the population relies on surface water
	67% of the groundwater supplies have an approved program.
	51% of the surface water supplies have an approved program.
Wisconsin	Approximately 45% of Wisconsin's residents rely on community groundwater supplies and about 25% rely on surface water intake systems. About 25% of groundwater systems and 0% of surface water systems have a wellhead protection plan for all their wells or their entire system.
Wyoming	80% use groundwater, about 50% use surface water. We have approved only one Aquifer Protection Plan. WY does not have an FTE or budget associated with SWAP or WHP, so we really don't have a functioning program.